



Institute for Life Course and Aging  
UNIVERSITY of TORONTO

# **An Analysis of Second Language Training Programs for Older Adults Across Canada**

**Prepared by**

**Lynn McDonald, PhD,  
Usha George, PhD  
Laura Cleghorn, MA and  
Kristyna Karenova, MA**

**for**

**Citizenship and Immigration Canada, Ontario Region**

**January, 2008**

**Funded by:**



**Citizenship and  
Immigration Canada**

**Citoyenneté et  
Immigration Canada**



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>I. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>II. METHODOLOGY.....</b>	<b>3</b>
A NOTE ON TERMINOLOGY .....	4
<b>III. LITERATURE REVIEW .....</b>	<b>6</b>
TWO EXEMPLARY ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROGRAMS .....	6
BEST PRACTICES IN THE LITERATURE .....	8
<b>IV. PROGRAM ANALYSIS .....</b>	<b>12</b>
PROGRAM STRUCTURE .....	12
THE OLDER LEARNERS .....	17
PROGRAM MODELS .....	17
BEST PRACTICES .....	20
<b>V. KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW SUMMARY.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>VII. REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>APPENDIX A: TABLE 1, PROGRAM STRUCTURE .....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>APPENDIX B: TABLE 2, PROGRAM DETAILS .....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>APPENDIX C: TABLE 3, PROFILE OF OLDER LEARNERS.....</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>APPENDIX D: FRAMEWORK FOR DATA COLLECTION .....</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>APPENDIX E: LETTER OF INTRODUCTION – ENGLISH AND FRENCH .....</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>APPENDIX F: KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW GUIDE .....</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>APPENDIX G: LIST OF PARTICIPATING PROGRAMS AND KEY INFORMANTS.....</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>APPENDIX H: RESOURCES.....</b>	<b>57</b>



## Acknowledgments

The Research Team would like to acknowledge all of the second language training program staff who enthusiastically participated in this program analysis. Their support of and contribution to this project is very much appreciated.

The Team would like to thank Mirela Cherciov, Research Assistant, for her dedicated work, as well as Susan Murphy and Nina Carlton for their administrative support at the Institute for Life Course and Aging, University of Toronto.

Lastly, we thank Citizenship and Immigration Canada, Ontario Region for the opportunity to undertake this project.



## I. Introduction

The federal government first offered second language training in 1947. Since that time, English as a Second Language and French as a Second Language training programs have been administered by the federal government and by various ministries in each province. The programs have focused on preparing non-official language speakers for the labour market, for the test of citizenship, and for general orientation to Canadian society. With the introduction of the Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada (LINC) program in 1992, the federal program shifted from a focus on labour market preparation to general instruction and newcomer integration (Shane, 1992), while the provinces have continued to offer credit and non-credit second language classes as a component of adult education. English and French language training programs are offered across the country by community colleges, school boards, universities, non-profit agencies, and by the private sector.

The organization of English and French language training programs for adults is quite complex given that the programs are funded, administered, and delivered under different agreements from province to province (Cleghorn, 2000). Manitoba, British Columbia, and Ontario, for example, have federal-provincial agreements for the administration and delivery of second language training programs developed for settlement and integration (TESL Ontario, 2007; Taviss & Simces, 2004). In Alberta, the two levels of government have a “statement of understanding” to administer and deliver second language training programs (Taviss & and Simces, 2004), and Québec assumes responsibility for the delivery of its French language training programs. Burnaby (1998) notes that “the negotiated character of these federal-provincial relationships . . . has permitted a degree of useful flexibility in ESL program development” (p. 255).

Language training programs for adult immigrants and refugees assist with the processes of settlement and integration and are often a precursor to further training and employment. For seniors, however, most of whom are not destined for the labour market, language training classes are a primary means of accessing information about settlement and a means to social integration. In addition to the instrumental utility of such programs, they are now being recognized as an invaluable means of building social networks and social support to mitigate against isolation and the challenges of adapting to a new country and culture. Some older immigrants and refugees experience multiple losses as a result of migration; for example, loss of status, family members, friends, and a sense of place. Second language training programs can restore and renew social supports, with profound and positive effects on the health and well-being of older adults (Bello, 1994; Taylor, Taylor-Henley, & Doan, 2005).

In a recent consultation on the settlement and language training needs of newcomers, seniors listed language training as third of the top three priorities, preceded by health and employment (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2006). Since older adults are a



growing population due to family-class immigration (Lamba, Mulder, & Wilkinson, 2000), the demand for English and French language training for older adults will likely continue at current levels, if not increase. Given this trend, the value of and necessity for these programs should not be underestimated.

The intent of this current project was to analyse second language training programs for older adults across Canada to identify the conditions that best accomplish the goal of learning English or French and promote social, cultural and economic integration into Canada. This analysis of best practices and models of English/French language training programs focused, therefore, on the dual outcomes of the programs: language acquisition and integration, as well as the special needs of the older adult learner. The analysis was guided by the following research questions:

- 1) What models and practices of English and French language training programs for older adults best achieve the goal of learning a second language?
- 2) What models and practices best facilitate social, cultural, and economic integration into Canada?

## II. Methodology

The above questions were addressed using the following methodology, which had three components:

- 1) **Literature Review:** The literature review focused on language training program models and best practices for older learners in Canada, the United States, and Australia because these programs have well-developed adult education and adult second language training systems. Both academic and non-academic, or “grey” literatures, were included in the search, the latter to capture research that is not widely published. The review focused on models, best practices, and the specific needs of older adults learning a second language.
- 2) **Program Analysis:** The Research Team identified 36 English/French language training agencies across the country that met the following criteria:
  - a. Offered one or more English or French language training programs designated for seniors (age 55 and over), or
  - b. Offered one or more English or French language training programs for adults with high enrolment of older adults age 55 and over.

Once the above criteria were met, 25 programs were selected to represent different program types (provincial/federal programs) and settings (community colleges, school boards, and non-profit agencies). The Research Team’s proposal



aimed to analyse 15 to 20 programs, but since there were more programs across the country than expected, 25 language training agencies that met the above criteria were selected for inclusion in the project. Twenty three were able to participate (see Appendix G). In June 2007, Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC) sent a letter to each agency to inform them of the project and to let them know that they would be contacted by the research team (see Appendix E). In the meantime, the team developed a data collection tool, comprised of 51 questions in five categories: program structure, facilities, learner characteristics, program model, and best practices. The team members contacted the agencies and sent them a guideline for the areas to be discussed in the interview.

Between July and September, 2007, 23 English/French language training agencies across Canada with language programs for seniors participated in digitally-recorded telephone interviews. Six agencies suggested that the team interview more than one staff member from the language training program; that is, a program coordinator and/or a teacher/instructor. There were, therefore, 29 interviews conducted for the 23 agencies analysed. Two of the programs included in the analysis were French language training programs; for these, all materials were provided in French and the interviews were conducted in French. The interviews ranged from 45 minutes to 2 hours in duration. They were then transcribed and the data analysed using NVivo, a qualitative software program.

- 3) **Key Informant Interviews:** The research team conducted telephone interviews with five ESL/FSL “experts” with regard to program models and best practices for older learners (see Appendix G for the list of participants and Appendix F for the interview guide). Two of the key informants were academics in the field of ESL/FSL, two were experienced in LINC program delivery, and the fifth key informant was experienced in community-based ESL program delivery. The interviews were approximately 1 hour in duration, and were digitally recorded, transcribed, thematically coded, and summarized.

### ***A Note on Terminology***

There are many different terms in use in the field of English/French language training for older adults. The most obvious of these is the term “older adults” which has become the norm in gerontology, but perhaps less so in the social services sectors, where “seniors” is still used frequently. Both terms will be used.

The report will also use both the terms “teacher” and “instructor” when referring to teaching staff in language training programs, as the two terms are often used interchangeably when describing both the federal LINC programs and the provincial ESL and community language training programs. “LINC” and “CLIC” refer to federally-funded English and French programs and, for the purposes of this report, the terms “ESL” and “FSL” refer only to the provincial-level school board and college non-credit programs when discussed in the program analysis. “Non-credit” is a term referring to



school board or college programs where courses do not count towards completion of a grade, diploma, or degree.



### III. Literature Review

This review is focused exclusively on English/French language training models and best practices for older adults from the literature in Canada, the United States, and Australia. Academic and “grey” literatures were searched to locate both published and unpublished works. This review confirms that the literature in the field of English/French language training for older adults is not extensive, yet reveals basic commonalities in what is understood as best practices. The majority of the literature is “grey;” that is, most articles are reports prepared by organizations, and fewer are published articles in professional journals. In 1994, an American ESL teacher searched for studies on older adult second language learners, found that there were few available, and ended up conducting his own small-scale project, which is still frequently cited (Bello, 1994). There remains an absence of published work in this area. The review that follows outlines the most common elements of models and best practices, beginning with a description of two programs that exemplify best practices in English language training service delivery for seniors.

#### ***Two Exemplary English Language Programs***

##### **English for Older Adults, Winnipeg, Manitoba**

The English for Older Adults program at Age & Opportunity in Winnipeg, Manitoba has operated since 1999, and is well-documented as a best practices model. The program is provincially funded by Manitoba Labour and Immigration, and relies upon in-kind donations (such as classroom space) from its community partners. The summary that follows is drawn from a final report on the 2-year pilot of the program (Taylor, Taylor-Henley, Doan, & Newman, 2003). During the pilot’s timeframe, from 2001-2002, the program provided English language instruction to over 319 immigrant seniors, in 21 classes, at 10 locations throughout the city.

Classes for seniors are offered mornings, afternoons, and evenings, 7 days a week, 12 months of the year. The program is open to all immigrants age 55 and over, regardless of immigration status or length of time in Canada. The curriculum is based on the learner’s needs, and is led by a teacher and teacher consultant.

There is childminding for the seniors who are caregivers, and an extensive transportation service that relies upon 27 volunteer drivers “for those seniors who are not well connected to public transportation routes or who feel unable to use public transportation” (Taylor et al., 2003, p. 32). The classes are held in wheelchair-accessible ethno-cultural and seniors’ centres with social services available. There are components to the language program that create other opportunities to use English: a “language partners” program to practice with other English-speaking seniors, and an intergenerational program that links language learners with public school students. The seniors evaluate the classes and are



involved in the overall evaluation of the centre. The ethno-cultural and seniors' centres also encourage seniors to participate in activities outside of English classes.

The program relies upon a strong force of volunteers, and employs community liaison workers who are members of the local ethno-cultural groups. Liaison workers engage in outreach, refer students to the program, and follow up on absenteeism. These workers are part of the Distributed Leadership model (DL) employed by Age & Opportunity in order to ensure that ethno-cultural communities are involved in program decision-making, direction, and development.

The English classes for seniors address social and psychological needs, and build "social literacy" - that is, familiarity and comfort with social interactions in the dominant culture (Taylor et al., 2003). In a recent publication from this program, the authors identify further ways in which it mitigates isolation and promotes social literacy. In an analysis of 139 stories collected from their senior students, "isolation" emerged as a primary theme. Students experienced isolation, for instance, while performing unpaid work in their families' homes, and due to unfamiliarity with language and dominant culture. Some identified winter as a particularly isolating time (Taylor, Taylor-Henley and Doan, 2005).

The study found that the program fostered the development of social networks and friendships, and provided opportunities for older persons to volunteer and become active in the mainstream community. The authors make a strong case for the beneficial effects of the programs for seniors because they "provide older persons with the tools to combat depression, anxiety, abuse, and isolation" (Taylor et al., 2005, p.32). They note that mental health practitioners and policy-makers have underemphasized the value of such programs and urge that more programs be available to Canada's older immigrants, especially as family re-unification programs continue to expand.

### **ESL for Older Adults, Yarra, Melbourne, Australia**

In the late 1990s, a consortium of social service agencies in the City of Yarra conducted a needs assessment and action research project in which they piloted and evaluated three ESL classes for adults age 50 and over. The classes were open to all immigrants, regardless of how long they had been in the country. They included an intergenerational component where the senior learners conversed with children to practice English and share their experiences. The 20-week classes had 10 participants each and ran twice a week for 2 or 3 hours. Transportation was provided by the City of Yarra.

The project report (Nicholls & Raleigh, 1998) presents the teaching materials developed as part of the project, and makes several conclusions as to "best practices" based on researchers' and participants' evaluations:

- A 20 week course duration is too short; in order to be effective, courses should run for at least 12 months, and for more than 5 hours.



- Seniors benefit from being with their peers, whether in a linguistically and/or ethnically “mixed” class or an ethno-specific class. In both cases, students share similar pacing and learning needs.
- Students are most interested in oral communication skills rather than reading or writing.
- Teachers must accommodate various factors that affect seniors’ learning, such as difficulties with hearing, memory, and concentration, low confidence, and health problems.
- The classroom setting should be physically comfortable and suitable for seniors.
- A supportive environment reduces anxiety and promotes confidence in the learners.
- Confidence using English is just as important as linguistic correctness; the social outcomes are as valuable as the language outcomes.

### ***Best Practices in the Literature***

The two programs described above demonstrate a range of good practices, many of which are echoed in the literature. These and other aspects are detailed in the following literature review on ESL training for older adults. The review is organized according to various aspects of program delivery, including program structure, linked services, curriculum, the specific needs of older learners, the theme of isolation, and pedagogy.

#### **Program Structure**

As has been found in the programs described above, research indicates that seniors do best with short classes a few days a week, offered throughout the week and weekend to accommodate days and times that are most suitable to them (Taviss & Simces, 2004). Bello (1994) advises that older adults should not have designated classes because the mix of younger and older students is beneficial to the class.

There is a general recognition in the literature that classes for older adults should be fully accessible regardless of immigration class or years in the country, as was the case in the above examples. Kenny and Cap (2003) discuss how in the 1990s ethno-cultural, faith, women’s and seniors’ groups in Manitoba lobbied federal and provincial officials to eliminate the restriction of immigrants who had become citizens from second language classes, and were eventually successful. Refugee claimants and Canadian citizens are not eligible for the federal LINC/CLIC programs, while they are able to attend the provincial ESL/FSL programs. Several critiques have been lodged against these criteria. Some older immigrants are fulfilling family or other obligations and are not able to access language training for 5 to 7 years after arrival. In this time, they obtain their Canadian citizenship and thus become ineligible for the LINC/CLIC program (Community Social Planning Council of Toronto 2005; Wilson, 2004; ECALA, 2006).

Several components of the programs described above deserve further mention with regard to program structure. The importance of transportation cannot be stressed enough



for older adult learners. The Age & Opportunity's impressive solution to this challenge (volunteer drivers), and the resulting success of their program, attests to the importance of providing free and safe access to seniors' programs (Community Social Planning Council, 2005; Taylor et al., 2003; Nicholls & Raleigh, 1998). A second component involves the provision of social activities, volunteering, or other programs that offer learners the opportunity to practice English both in and outside of the classroom (e.g. intergenerational and "language partners" programs) (ECALA, 2006).

### **Linked Services**

The literature says surprisingly little about the value of linking older adult English language training programs with community or settlement services. Yet the information gathered from programs across Canada reveals another story. The overwhelming majority of the 36 seniors' programs initially identified for this project are located in community-based organizations. Morgan (2002) argues that language training programs in these types of settings help some learners feel a greater sense of comfort and ownership in the program. Access to linked community and/or settlement services should be a necessary component of all programs due to the profound benefits for senior language learners (Cleghorn, 2000). CIC is considering increasing the availability of settlement services at LINC sites (TESL Ontario, 2007).

### **Curriculum**

Knowledge gleaned from existing programs, as well as from the literature, indicates the importance of consultation with students about the preferred content of their curricula. (Zhu, 2007; Taylor et al., 2003; Kenny & Cap, 2003; Morgan, 2002). Several researchers advocate a focus on communicative activities in real-life situations, and curricula that reflect and value seniors' experiences (Wilson, 2004; Bello, 1994). Morgan (2002) also stresses that, where language instruction is integrated with community or settlement services, curricula should be modified to reflect the services offered.

### **Older Adult Learners**

Older learners may require tailored programs that take into account the effects of aging, such as problems with memory, cognition, hearing, vision, and other health problems. (Zhu, 2007; Taviss & Simces, 2004). Such factors can substantially influence language learning, and it is commonly understood that success at second language acquisition steadily declines throughout the life span (Hakuta, Bialystok, & Wiley, 2003). To address these challenges, teachers must create a comfortable and positive learning environment that recognises and reinforces students' abilities (Spore, 1980; Bello, 1994).

Other factors that affect second language acquisition include education level and first language literacy. Reports on English language and literacy programs in British Columbia and Ontario identify that literacy is a significant issue for older learners (ECALA, 2006; Cummings, Jacot, & Parau, 2006). Studies suggest that students with low first language literacy should not be placed in regular English language classes, and



that designated literacy classes should be created to address the needs of these learners (Cummings et al., 2006; Burnaby & Bell, 1991).

### **Isolation and Integration**

Many older immigrants and refugees are at risk of isolation and may have few opportunities to participate in social, recreational and educational activities (ECALA, 2005; Taylor et al, 2005). Bello (1994) notes that many older adults have experienced multiple losses as a result of migration. English language classes offer the opportunity for these seniors to renew their lost social networks and enhance their integration in the new society.

Older learners' motivations for acquiring a second language are multiple, but are most often for communication (with grandchildren and/or with mainstream institutions) or for social reasons, where language acquisition can be a goal secondary to social networking (Zhu, 2007; Taylor et al., 2005; Kenny & Cap, 2003; Morgan, 2002; Nicholls & Raleigh, 1998; Bello, 1994). In the field of gerontology, social networks and social integration are understood to have positive influences on health and well-being. For example, a Canadian study of social networks and self-rated health status in two communities found that adults over age 65 experienced a positive association between community involvement, as reflected by their number of social activities, and good health (Zunzunegui et al., 2004). While communicative competence in English or French is important and useful to older adults in Canada, social integration and improved health and well-being are less recognized but equally important aspects of language training programs.

### **Pedagogy**

Certain teaching techniques have been shown to be effective in mitigating low literacy, low education and the effects of aging on learning; these include the use of repetition, working with audio recordings, and a slow pace (Wilson, 2004; Nicholls & Raleigh, 1998). The report on the Australian ESL for Older Adults program suggests that "[older] students should be taught in a spiral form rather than in a linear form . . . [w]ork is constantly being revised as well as new concepts being taught" (Nicholls & Raleigh, 1998, p. 21). Several studies note the beneficial effects of bilingual teachers/instructors or teaching assistants/interpreters to increase the participation of learners, especially where literacy and a lack of formal education are at issue (Zhu, 2007; Taylor et al., 2003; Derwing & Malicky, 1993; 1992).

Theorists in adult education and critical pedagogy note that English language training classes have the capacity to empower learners, as well as increase their social networks and, therefore, their social capital (Fitzgerald, 2000; Orem, 2001). In English language classes for seniors, most of which take place in community-based settings, the social aspects of the programs appear to take precedence over linguistic ones. Morgan (2002) argues that English skills are not, however, neglected, but that the integration of real-



life issues and contexts identified by the learners themselves means that these programs have the potential to transform, engage, and improve people's lives.

While the literature on English language training for seniors is not extensive, common elements and practices are discernable. This knowledge will be verified and expanded upon by the program analysis that follows. While the focus of this literature review was purposefully limited in scope, it would be useful to consider a wider review of the literature to include older adult literacy, language acquisition and linguistics, adult education, gerontology, and immigration and refugee studies to contribute to a greater understanding of English/French language training for older adults.



## IV. Program Analysis

This section focuses on the data collected from interviews conducted with the 23 participating English/French language training agencies. The data, summarized below, is also presented in table format in Appendices A and B. It should be noted that the information gathered here represents the impressions of one (or in some cases two) staff members who were interviewed for the program analysis. The program analysis could be further enhanced by consultation with older adult learners across the country.

### ***Program Structure***

#### **Program Type**

Among the 23 participating agencies, 21 offered English and two French language training for seniors. Language training across these agencies was delivered under two major program types: federal LINC/CLIC programs and provincial language training programs. The latter can be further divided into two program formulas: ESL/FSL school-board programs and community-based programs. Out of the 21 English language training agencies, three offered a LINC program only, three offered both a LINC and an ESL school-board program (one of which was offered through a “blended” formula), three offered an ESL school-board program only, and 12 offered a community program. Out of the two French language training agencies, one offered a CLIC program and one an FSL school board program. This makes for a total of six LINC, one CLIC, six ESL, one FSL and 12 English language training community-based programs (see Appendices A and B).

As outlined in the methodology, two types of programs qualified for this study: programs with classes specifically designated for seniors and those with classes open to all ages but with a significant number of seniors enrolled. Three out of the six LINC programs analyzed were geared towards seniors, while the remaining three, along with the CLIC program, saw a significant senior enrolment, particularly in the lower level classes (Literacy to Level 3). One agency was to start up a senior-specific LINC program in fall 2007. Thirteen out of the 18 provincial English language training programs, as well as the one FSL program, were senior-specific, while the remaining five provincial programs had mixed-age classes with a significant number of senior students.

#### **Funding**

The language training programs examined were supported through several different funding mechanisms. The associated costs included rent, staff salaries (teaching, administrative, and support), teaching materials, transportation costs (to and from location, field trips), child-minding, and miscellaneous expenses, such as coffee, tea, snacks, special events, etc.

While the LINC/CLIC programs received full funding from the federal government and were administered at no cost to the student, the funding formulas varied considerably



across the different types of provincial programs. The ESL/FSL school board programs received funding from provincial governments; in some cases, this was supplemented by student fees. However, this funding did not go to the community-based organizations which housed the programs but to the school board itself, which also collected all of the student fees. Funding sources for the community language training programs included the three levels of government, donations, endowment programs, sponsorships, fundraising, membership fees, and program student fees. Nine provincial English language training programs and the one FSL program were in part supported through student fees collected for each instructional term. One community language program collected occasional student fees based on need. One ESL program asked for a yearly administrative fee.

Program student fees ranged anywhere from 13 cents to \$1.37 per instructional hour. The main reason given for collecting student fees was to cover expenses related to photocopying, teaching materials, field trips, honorariums for volunteer teachers, and salaries for non-volunteer teachers. Students in three English language training community programs and the one FSL program were also required to pay membership fees to the organization that housed the program. These ranged from \$10 to \$15 per year.

## **Setting**

The English/French language training programs examined in this study, both the LINC/CLIC and the provincial programs, were delivered by a variety of service-providing organizations and in a variety of settings. Six programs were administered by senior-serving organizations, four by multi-service organizations with senior programming, eight by immigrant-serving organizations, and five by school board-governed institutions, such as Adult Continuing Education ESL departments of various school boards and colleges. Organizations that utilized spaces other than their own to run their senior language classes, such as the school board-governed institutions and several immigrant-serving organizations, often benefited from partnerships with community-based organizations that housed their programs. The spaces were often offered for free or at reduced rates and sometimes were offered in seniors' apartment buildings. Programs run in locations belonging to the organization itself were housed at no cost.

## **Partnerships**

The language training programs for seniors examined in this study assumed a number of different partnerships. The nature of the partnerships was quite varied, with some more formal than others, but was mostly related to the following four aspects: funding, class location, language-related activities, and support services. Some language training programs for seniors had partnerships outside of the service-providing organization. Examples of these included:

- partnerships with ESL organizations in the area for information exchange and for professional development opportunities
- partnerships with community-based organizations which provided spaces to house the programs



- partnerships with libraries to run informal drop-in English social groups for those who did not qualify for the regular program
- partnerships among different ethno-specific, community-based language programs for occasional joint classes, in English, to celebrate various customs and holidays
- partnerships with settlement agencies where students could access support services not offered by the language service provider.

The majority of the partnerships involved the service-providing organization itself. Some language programs were integrated into settlement, integration, and adaptation programs within the organization and/or the students had access to other programs within the organization and were permitted to participate in its various activities. These included counselling, advocacy, legal aid, women services, senior services, home visits, health care services, housing services, wellness and exercise programs, and special events such as workshops, conferences, and guest speaker series on subjects related to settlement and general health and safety issues. A number of these activities were run in partnerships with other organizations. In some cases, participation in them involved paying the organization's membership fees.

If an organization offered no or a limited number of non-language programs relevant to senior immigrant learners, it was, in most cases, able to refer them elsewhere. However, language programs in multi-service organizations with settlement, integration, and adaptation programs, or those administered in senior-serving organization (senior centres or multi-service centres with senior programming), clearly allowed for easier access to available support services relevant to seniors and better accounted for their needs. Several of the participating agencies remarked that being able to provide on-site assistance made a significant difference in making this particular group of learners feel welcome and less overwhelmed by the language program.

### **Eligibility**

The specific eligibility criteria for a LINC/CLIC program were based on immigration status. Senior-specific LINC classes targeted students 55 years of age and above, with some flexibility considering differing cultural definitions of "senior." The eligibility criteria varied slightly more across the provincial language training programs. The majority had an age criterion of 55+, again with some flexibility. Four programs were ethno-specific. Most did not allow visitors into the program, such as vacationers and student/work visa holders. And, as mentioned above, five programs required that interested students first become members of the service-providing organization.

### **Program details**

Details such as number of classes, class size, schedule, location, and staffing depended in part on the size and type of the service-providing organization and the area it administered. Close to half of the service providers who ran a seniors-specific language program offered only one senior class. Some service providers were aware of a demand



for more classes, for example, at different times during the week, but did not have sufficient resources to meet the demand. The other senior-specific programs had anywhere between 3 and 21 senior classes. Language programs not specifically geared towards seniors had anywhere from 2 to 14 classes with a significant number of senior enrolments. The average class size ranged from 5 to 35 students. Classes were offered every day of the week, mornings, afternoons, and evenings. Seniors who provided childcare for their grandchildren seemed to have a preference for classes on Saturday mornings. Most classes were run out of one location, except in programs where a large number of classes were offered.

## **Staff**

Teachers of senior language classes were either paid, volunteer, or a combination of the two. While all LINC/CLIC instructors were remunerated, the type of teaching staff in the provincial English/French language training programs varied depending on whether the program was a provincial school board program or a community program. Teachers in charge of school board programs were paid by, and came from, the school board. Only one board-governed program was run entirely by volunteer teachers. The blended school board ESL/LINC program was run by a paid teacher with the support of volunteer teaching assistants. Six English language training community programs were run by paid teachers and six by volunteer teachers. Three had volunteer teaching assistants, who helped to provide individual attention or language partners who provided additional one-on-one language training.

Fourteen senior language programs were taught by certified ESL/FSL teachers; however, this was not necessarily a requirement. Non-certified teachers included those preparing to undertake the TESL certification, teachers with ESL teaching experience but no formal training, post-secondary students interested in teaching English overseas, former teachers, and people with no teaching or ESL background. Certification seemed to be less of a requirement in programs that relied on volunteer teaching staff.

Ethno-specific programs or programs with a large number of learners from the same cultural background often employed bilingual teachers. It was noted that this made the students feel less intimidated. Also, while some programs preferred older teachers, others opted for a more intergenerational approach. Reasons were given for both: older teachers were thought to be better aware of the needs of seniors and assured a well-attended class; younger teachers were seen to help learners better relate to their grandchildren and to younger generations in general.

Overall, given that most seniors have not been in a classroom setting in a long time, that their language acquisition abilities are more limited, and that they may face physical or psychological barriers, the ideal language teacher for this group of learners was often identified as someone with a high level of patience, understanding, and flexibility. He or she had to be willing to continuously repeat the material, to understand the various needs of seniors, and to be able to lead multi-level classes through a learner-driven approach. It



was important that teachers be friendly, caring, and engaging, and able to maintain a very calm environment. In fact, attendance in these programs largely depended on the kind of relationship that the teacher was able to develop with the senior learners.

Other staff involved in running the language-training programs included program coordinators, support workers, and various administrative personnel. All programs examined were overseen by a coordinator; in a few cases the coordinators were in charge of only the senior language program, but in most, they coordinated multiple programming - all senior programming, all language programming, or all programming in the organization as a whole.

The majority of programs relied on the administrative staff already in place in the service-providing organizations; in some cases, this staff was volunteer. Some programs also had access to social support workers, but these workers were usually not connected exclusively to the seniors' language program. Other staff included curriculum consultants and volunteers involved in organizing and running extracurricular language activities, such as conversation cafés, language-specific social circles, or book clubs.

### **Program Evaluations**

Almost all of the participating second-language programs had undergone some type of evaluation. Several service providers were required, in their funding agreements, to conduct program evaluations. However, the most frequent forms of evaluating the program were ongoing oral feedback from students and end-of-term written class evaluations concerning the course topics, materials, and the teacher's performance. In some of the provincial school board programs, teacher performance was formally assessed by an evaluator from the school board.

### **Accessibility**

With a few exceptions, classes took place in wheelchair accessible locations that were easily accessible by public transport. Some senior learners did not mind traveling long distances to attend classes, especially if the service-providing organization was familiar to them, offered services and programs of interest, and provided a comfortable social atmosphere in the company of their peers. All of the LINC/CLIC programs provided transit tickets to their students but did not provide any other transportation services. Funding in the provincial language training programs was in most cases not sufficient to cover transportation. Only four gave out transit tickets; two out of the four provided tickets only in case of financial difficulty, and one only for field trips. Of all the participating language programs, only two provided pick-up and drop-off services, based on need.

### **Child-minding**

Only two service providers consistently offered child-minding to their older adult learners. In LINC programs, if the seniors were not the legal guardians of their grandchildren, they were not allowed to use available child-minding services. In many



cases, this would have facilitated the senior learners' participation in the language program as their main reason for having immigrated to Canada was to help take care of their grandchildren while the parents were at work.

## ***The Older Learners***

The following data gathered from the program analysis establishes a profile of older learners in English/French language programs (see Appendix C).

### **Demographic profile**

Approximately one-third of the programs analysed were attended by older adults age 55 and up, while in another one-third of the classes the students were age 65 and up. A few programs had a younger demographic, with adults in their 50s, and two programs had an older age range, where all of the students were between ages 75 and 80. The majority of the learners were women; the most common female to male ratio in the senior classes was 70:30. Only two programs had an even gender split.

Nineteen out of the 23 participating agencies had "mixed" ethno-cultural populations, while four ran ethno-specific programs for Chinese, Latin American, and South American older adults. The number of years the students had been in Canada varied significantly. In the LINC/CLIC programs, the number of recent immigrant students was higher. The length of time since arrival to Canada also ranged significantly in the provincial language training programs. Approximately two-thirds were attended by a mix of newly arrived immigrants (2 years or less in Canada) and those who had been in Canada for 3 to 10 years. The remaining one-third of the provincial programs was attended by immigrants who had lived in Canada for 11 to 20 years.

The teachers/instructors and coordinators were also asked to assess the literacy levels of their students. Over one half of the programs had students with a range of literacy levels in the classroom. Five had students with no first language literacy.

### **Motivations to Learn and Dimensions of Aging**

According to the program staff, their older adults were motivated to attend the program by the need to be "functional" in English or French, and to communicate with their grandchildren and communities, to socialize, and to build social networks. The staff were also asked to identify the main physical and cognitive factors affecting their learners. In addition to physical and cognitive problems, they mentioned isolation, anxiety, depression and previous experiences of trauma.

## ***Program Models***

### **Purpose or primary objectives of the program**

Most teachers and coordinators defined the primary objective of the programs as the acquisition of basic English or French language skills to facilitate older learners'



integration and participation in their communities. One teacher explained that programs focus on “functional communication and not perfect communication.” Similarly, several coordinators reported that their senior students needed to understand and speak “survival English.”

While some programs referred to the Canadian Language Benchmarks to define their objectives, others reflected a more informal purpose, with the primary aim being a general improvement of English. This was especially the case for programs made up of conversation classes, ESL drop-ins, or ESL interest group classes. In addition to language learning, programs aimed to promote community building, community development, social support and networking, and learning about different cultures.

### **Curriculum Guidelines**

The vast majority of the program curricula were described as “learner-driven.” Teachers looked to the students to establish what they needed to learn on a particular day, or over a set period of time. Some teachers began each class by asking what the students wanted to learn on that day. One teacher noted that, with seniors, lessons need to be limited to one or two key components.

The LINC/CLIC programs used curriculum guidelines based on the Canadian Language Benchmarks (CLB). Instructors in these programs adapted the curriculum themes and materials to reflect the needs and interests of their senior learners. Many of the teachers in the provincial language training programs also used the CLB guidelines, which they supplemented with material from other resources that they had found effective with older adults. Some reported entirely designing their own curriculum. Several teachers also expressed that creating their own instructional material took a significant amount of time, especially since no senior-specific teaching material was available.

### **Curriculum Content**

Respondents were asked to discuss how their class content related to and valued the experiences of senior learners. The program instructors and coordinators referred frequently to the use of a learner-based curriculum as one way of integrating the learners’ experiences and needs into daily classroom activities. They mentioned frequent discussions about the students’ different cultures and traditions. Some classes gave students the opportunity to demonstrate a skill or talent in class, such as Tai Chi, flower arranging, woodworking, or cooking.

Several teachers mentioned that sharing experiences could be challenging, since differences in socioeconomic class, education, and profession can leave some older adults feeling excluded or nervous about taking part. Sometimes students had been through traumatic experiences and talking about themselves had the potential to unearth sensitive feelings and issues. All programs also provided information about Canadian social, political, legal, and health systems.



## Levels

Overall, seniors attended lower level language classes, ranging from Pre-benchmark to Level 3, as defined by the Canadian Language Benchmarks, or Literacy, Beginner and Intermediate classes, in cases where the CLB were not used. However, the majority of the classes attended by senior learners were Literacy, Level 1, or Beginner classes. In cases in which only a single class for seniors was available, it was most often multi-level. In some cases, the differences between the students' language skills were significant; in others, a multi-level class spanned Levels 1 to 3. In larger programs with many seniors' classes, there appeared to be more multi-level classes (Levels 1 to 3) [geared toward seniors – redundant?].

In general, the programs did not restrict the length of time that a student was allowed to stay in each level or class; there was also no mandatory completion time. Several respondents noted that it can take up to 3 years, or sometimes much longer, for an older adult student to achieve one level. Because the LINC program forbids enrolment by Canadian citizens, learners were frequently referred to an ESL program following their attainment of citizenship.

## Evaluation

The LINC programs made use of the LINC Assessment Centres for language assessment and placement in an appropriate level. Students are assessed (using the Canadian Language Benchmarks), according to their abilities in comprehension, speaking, reading, and writing, and then placed in the appropriate level. Some respondents were critical of this form of language assessment as it places students according to their *lowest* level of skill. Respondents noted that oral communication and comprehension are most important to older adults at this stage in their lives, yet many are placed in lower level classes due to their weaker reading and writing abilities. The literature review also establishes that older adult learners differ from other learners in that they need “functional” English – communicative skills, most of all. As for the provincial programs, the majority of those that offered more than one senior course conducted in-house placement assessments. The nature of these assessments was informal and performance-based.

Testing of student progress was mainly informal, based on observation of class performance, homework assignments, or student portfolios. Formal tests were mainly used in programs that followed the CLB curriculum guidelines. Students were assessed mid-term or at the end of the course. Teachers/instructors and coordinators commented, however, that their older learners did not like testing and would often not come to class on the day a test was being written. The main reason given was their reluctance to change classes and teachers, which would be required if they did well. Location and teacher continuity were important factors in senior student attendance. In one program, a respondent noted, students feared that failing a test would show a lack of progression and possibly lead to program cancellation. Finally, none of the programs conducted a formal outcome or exit assessment.



## **Learning Outside of the Classroom**

The programs examined commonly included class outings, such as walks in the neighbourhood, to a park or library, or to the local mall. This gave students the opportunity to use and practice their English in an external social setting and to learn about community resources. One teacher called this an exercise in “living language.” Most programs were able to offer their students one or two field trips to an art gallery or a cultural or social event, but this largely depended on the programs’ financial resources, as well as weather conditions and the students’ mobility.

## ***Best Practices***

The points below are the best practices identified by the teachers/instructors and coordinators who participated in the project. These practices span the areas of recruitment, accessibility, class structure, instructor qualities, curriculum, pedagogy, extracurricular learning, and program funding.

### **Recruitment**

- Complex bi/multilingual outreach programs are necessary to raise awareness of senior English/French language training programs in the community.
- Community liaison workers should be appointed and funded to assist in student recruitment. Effective strategies include one-to-one contact, ongoing liaison work as well as print advertising.

### **Accessibility**

- Seniors benefit greatly from the provision of settlement support, such as housing, welfare, health and legal services, along with language instruction.
- Centres are ideally located close to seniors’ homes. As many immigrant seniors have limited financial resources, the provision of transit tickets is beneficial.
- It is helpful if classes of all levels are held in one location: many older adults are reluctant to advance if it means changing class locations.
- Senior students often report feeling more alert in morning classes and many prefer weekend attendance, particularly on Saturdays, which does not conflict with family obligations.
- Programs must be flexible so that seniors can stay as long as necessary in a particular level, or repeat classes in order to increase confidence and competence with various aspects of language learning.



## **Class structure**

- Groups of 10 or fewer students ensure increased individual attention. Lower level participants benefit from one-to-one pairing between students and teacher assistants.
- Classes are ideally composed of students with approximately the same language level; this helps to ensure that higher-level learners do not lose interest and lower-level students are not left behind.
- Classes specific to seniors/older adults are better able to focus on the needs of this population and maintain an appropriate learning pace.
- Linguistically homogenous classes benefit from an instructor who speaks the learners' first language, and acknowledges the seniors' home culture. Seniors often feel more comfortable with a bilingual teacher.

## **Instructor qualities**

- The best instructors are approachable, patient, reliable, and caring; they understand that senior learners are a distinct group.
- The instructor's role is more that of facilitator than lecturer. Lessons should avoid extensive lecturing and be activity-oriented, including much opportunity for language practice.
- Mutual respect between instructors and senior learners is crucial to ensuring continued attendance and effective learning. Instructors must be alert to seniors' communication needs, and respectful of their life experiences.
- While instructor age is not a significant consideration, older adult learning is best facilitated by someone who is mindful of students' particular psychological and physical needs. Intergenerational contact with youth, either as language assistants or language partners can enhance the learning experience.

## **Curriculum**

- Needs assessments should be conducted at the outset of language programs to ensure learner-centered, flexible curricula that benefit senior students.
- Language curricula must integrate opportunities for other learning: older adult immigrants attend programs not only to learn the language but also to learn about Canadian culture, acquire social skills, integrate in their new environments and, as a result, to maintain or increase their independence.



- Effective curricular content includes issues relevant to seniors' daily lives, for example, eating a healthy diet, communicating with health providers, and accessing various community resources.
- News and current events can serve as engaging curriculum materials. As a method of starting class conversation, for example, students can be encouraged to report, in their new language, on news stories of interest to them.
- Class materials should have enlarged print, since many older adults have some degree of vision impairment.

### **Pedagogy**

- Encouragement and validation of progress can be especially important for senior learners who may have little recent educational experience or may suffer from isolation in a new society.
- Senior learners often prefer teacher-directed activities, such as repeating words or readings, or answering questions, rather than self-motivated participation or working in pairs with other students.
- It is important to facilitate a sense of security and confidence in senior learners; students who show reluctance to complete tasks should not be singled out or forced. (For instance, one strategy is to ask the same question of all students, beginning with those who are more confident, and then turning to more passive learners.)
- Incorporating aspects of senior students' personal lives, such as home cultures, professions, family, and religion can encourage participation. Fun, flexible activities like singing and role-playing often work best for seniors.
- As some seniors may have difficulty with short-term memory, teachers must be prepared to adapt their strategies, for example, by repeating concepts and facts in different ways. It is important to build on past learning and review the relationship between older and new concepts.

### **Extracurricular Learning**

- As noted above, many seniors participate in language programs for social reasons. Events outside the classroom, such as ESL/FSL cafes and potlucks, social circles and reading clubs give students an opportunity to practice their language in a more relaxed, social environment.
- Cultural exchanges are important as learners put into practice what they have learned with a person who has a different ethnic background yet who is in the same situation.



Seniors' language acquisition may benefit from conversing with others from different cultural backgrounds.

- Field trips to supermarkets, parks, or museums are useful occasions for seniors to practice their language use and become accustomed to social interactions in Canadian society.

## **Funding**

- Adequate funding is essential for the employment of qualified language teachers, programs coordinators, and volunteers to meet the language training needs of Canada's growing immigrant senior population.
- Long-term funding for program sustainability is crucial.
- Many immigrant seniors require English/French language training even after they become Canadian citizens and no longer meet the eligibility criteria for LINC/CLIC programs. Funding is needed for more ESL/FSL classes that do not exclude Canadian citizens.
- French second language training programs identified the need for increased funding for programs and resources to better meet the needs of older adults seeking French language training.



## V. Key Informant Interview Summary

The following is a summary of five key informant interviews: two with academics in the field of ESL/FSL for older adults, two with LINC coordinators, and one with a coordinator of a community-based program that offers both ESL and LINC programs for seniors.

### ***Program Structure***

The key informants identified several important components of language training programs for seniors: the classes should be held 2 days/week for 2 to 3 hours in community centres, seniors' centres, seniors' buildings or other locations near seniors. At these locations, recreational and social activities should be available to older adults (e.g. dancing, computer training); other language programs (e.g. intergenerational programs, conversation classes, mentoring programs) should also be available so that seniors have opportunities to practice English. The language training programs should be linked to settlement services. Class trips and guest speakers should be regular features of the programs. Ideally, transportation should be provided in the form of a van or volunteer drivers so that seniors do not have to walk to and from transit stops. Childcare should be provided for seniors who look after children. The programs should be available in the summer as well as the rest of the year.

The interview participants were asked to comment on the merits of monolingual versus multilingual classes. They noted the benefits of multicultural classes, in that learners gain exposure to various cultures while practising their English. On the other hand, for seniors with lower levels of literacy and formal education, classes can be more effective when the learners share a language and cultural background. For some seniors, the comfort of a familiar cultural and linguistic group facilitates instruction. For higher levels (Level 3 and up), monolingual classes are considered less important.

Some key informants recommended a bilingual teacher or teacher assistant who speaks the language(s) of the group; another reported that, in "mixed" classes, the students often translate for each other, which can be an effective strategy. One participant suggested the use of itinerant teachers to support the in-class teacher. The itinerant teacher visits once or twice per week for one-on-one or small group work, which helps to mitigate the challenges of split-level classes, literacy issues, and disparate skills in the benchmarks of reading, writing, speaking, and listening.

### ***Benefits***

The key informants agreed that English/French language training programs perform a valuable service in providing older adults with opportunities to socialize outside their families and ethno-cultural groups. These opportunities can increase self-esteem, increase the knowledge older adults have about their communities, and provide mental



stimulation. One interview participant noted that the programs are a small cost to pay to support the independence and physical and mental well-being of older adults.

## ***Curriculum***

The key informants all stressed the importance of a student-centred curriculum that considers learners' experiences and accommodates their levels of literacy and education. Several participants noted the importance of using materials appropriate for adults, and avoiding those that might infantilize the learner. Participants felt that good materials did exist, but that the best approach was a "bare bones" or flexible curriculum that could be enhanced and revised according to the interests of individual classes.

## ***Teachers/Instructors***

One key informant stated that teachers were "the key to this whole program." Participants often noted the importance of patient, experienced teachers/instructors who enjoy working with seniors and who skilfully create a relaxed and comfortable learning environment. At one centre, the teachers complete rotations through classes of a variety of age levels, in order to gain a greater breadth of experience. Because the curriculum is learner-driven and constantly evolving, teachers require experience teaching and creating curricula in a less formal or structured milieu.

Key informants spoke of the importance of professionally trained teachers with adequate skills and experience. Federal LINC programs now require TESL-certified teachers. This effort to standardize teacher qualifications is regarded as important, however, several participants noted that it does not guarantee teacher expertise, and that the best teachers are not always TESL-certified. Some respondents said that ongoing professional development is becoming more widely available, and this is another effort to improve and "professionalize" the field of ESL. At the same time, there is great variability in these efforts across the country and within the provincial and federally-funded programs. One individual felt that the college system has established a commendable ethos of professional development, in which teachers receive due recognition, job security, and compensation. This respondent felt that these efforts should be replicated across the board to continue to improve the quality and professionalization of English and French language training across Canada.

## ***Challenges***

Several key informants referred to research on language acquisition and aging, which suggests that there is a steady decline in our ability to learn a new language as we grow older. Health problems, stress, literacy and education level, and motivation all affect the abilities of older adults to learn. Two individuals commented on the wide range of motivations for learning and the wide range of abilities of "older" learners, who can range in age from 55 to 85.

With regard to the often slower progress of older learners, one participant pointed out that, although the typical 4 to 6 hours per week is usually insufficient for language



learning, a more intensive program is often inappropriate for older learners. Several participants stated that funders generally recognize this challenge, and have realistic expectations about learning outcomes.

## **Barriers**

The key informants discussed the barriers that impinge on the participation of seniors in English/French language classes. Many of the older learners are family-sponsored, and there can be difficulties in access to classes because of financial barriers (no access to money for transportation), or because the seniors are expected to care for their grandchildren. Outreach is needed to ensure that seniors who are isolated in their homes can find out about classes available to them and that they have the ways and means to attend. Because of the eligibility criteria of the federal program, not all seniors wishing to access a free language program with a transportation subsidy can attend LINC classes. For example, if an older adult is a citizen and requires a free language training program with a transportation subsidy, then they cannot attend the federal program. In addition, the other programs (provincial and community-based) may not provide subsidized transportation or they may charge some program costs to the student. The key informants insisted that these financial barriers prevent low-income seniors from attending. Such barriers should be lifted to allow more seniors greater access to language training programs.

Some key informants noted that provincial ESL funding was not sufficient because it does not cover any associated costs, such as childcare, transportation and accommodation costs (e.g. rent). The service providers talked frequently about the challenges of finding free space to offer the classes, and absorbing the admin costs. This was a consistent and prevalent finding. As well, older adults require transportation and childcare subsidies. The funding structure of ESL programs means that the classes must be large to cover the costs of the teacher; in this regard, these programs do not serve older adults well, since older adults learn best in smaller classes.

Some centres have developed a strategy to address these limitations by offering “blended” LINC and ESL classes. This strategy offers a solution to one challenge: when older adults become citizens they do not have to move classes but can stay where they are. The key informants urged for adequate funding for all adult classes, which need to be accessible and available to all older adults regardless of immigration status.



## VI. Recommendations for Program Enhancements

This program analysis reveals that many English/French language training programs across the country have emerged from community-based initiatives to address the second language needs of immigrant and refugee seniors. Programs have been created through partnerships among provincial and federal funders, community-based agencies, ethno-specific organizations, seniors' centres, and older adults. In this respect, they exemplify community-based program development at its best. The challenge for these programs is to ensure that they are accessible to all immigrant and refugee seniors, are flexible enough to meet the needs of older learners, and achieve a high quality of service provision. Recommendations to enhance and improve the programs appear below:

### ***Partnerships***

- Partnerships among ethno-cultural and seniors' organizations are essential in order to develop additional and enhanced language training programs for older adults. The Age & Opportunity model is exemplary and demonstrates how community partnerships and dedicated outreach can foster a large-scale, successful program.
- Seniors' programs require adequately funded outreach mechanisms. A "community liaison worker" is one model; others may include innovative ways to promote programs in local ethno-cultural communities (via multilingual print, radio, TV, newspapers, etc.).
- Given that the social aspects of English/French programs are beneficial for seniors' health and well-being, program models that are linked to and encourage opportunities for social engagement, such as ESL drop-ins, ESL cafes, conversational classes, and interest groups, must be developed and supported. These programs should be additional to standard programs.
- English/French language training programs for older adults should be linked to community or settlement services to provide support, information and referral when needed, as well as opportunities for older adults to participate in activities and events outside of the classroom. Programs should develop mechanisms for connecting seniors to social networks in the agency itself and in their communities to help expand social networks outside of the classroom.
- Almost one-half of the programs included in this analysis did not receive designated funding, yet they provide valuable programs for older adults. These well-established programs, then, provide an excellent opportunity for partnerships among federal and provincial governments and service providing organizations to develop and enhance English/French language training services.



### ***Remove Barriers to Participation***

- Federal and provincial agreements should ensure that English/French language training classes for older adults are free of cost and available to those who need them.
- Full funding should be provided for transportation services and childminding. Rent for service provider organizations should be funded, so that second language training programs can be provided at no or minimal cost to senior students.
- Current LINC eligibility criteria exclude Canadian citizens and refugee claimants from access to LINC programs. Older learners who become citizens must then switch to a different program, possibly in a different location. Since program, location, and teacher continuity, as well as transportation subsidy, are all crucial to senior learners, eligibility criteria based on immigration status should be eliminated in the LINC program.
- Multi-year funding provides a more stable program for learners and a more stable environment for program delivery and staffing. Funders should offer more long-term contracts.

### ***Classroom Practices***

- Classes for seniors, particularly lower-level and literacy classes, should be bilingual and kept to a maximum of 10 students. It is recognized that a bilingual class may not be possible in regions where the seniors' population is smaller and more heterogeneous.
- Teachers/instructors should have an assistant, interpreter, itinerant teacher, or well-trained volunteer for one-on-one and small group support in senior classes.
- Multi-level classes should not contain more than two levels.
- Literacy classes for seniors should not be blended with any other levels.
- Older adults learn better in a "relaxed" environment where the teacher/instructor employs a non-linear, cyclical and flexible pedagogical method. This method builds on what has been learned before through repetition and recursive learning.

### ***Curriculum and Evaluation***

- There is a need for curriculum guidelines for older learners. The guidelines should provide teachers with relevant themes to address the life skills needed to participate and integrate in Canadian society. They should include a compilation of age-appropriate activities that focus on developing functional English/French skills and social integration, as well as a list of resources for older learners.



- Teacher education about older learners is needed on the following topics: appropriate curriculum guidelines that incorporate the dual goals of the program, “life skills” development and integration through language learning, theories of second language acquisition for older learners, and models and theories of community-based ESL/FSL pedagogy.
- Field trips are an important component of language learning as they allow the learners to “live” the language, while at the same time teaching them about their community and the resources available to them. However, learning outside of the classroom should take into consideration possible barriers to older learners’ participation, such as financial and mobility issues. It should be offered at no cost to the participant and with transportation provided.
- Performance outcomes for older adults should be measured differently than in standard classes. Evaluation and assessment must be non-threatening and “senior-friendly.”
- Given the above point, program and learner evaluations must recognize this difference with regard to senior learners. Funders must continue to have flexible expectations as to program outcomes.



## VII. References

- Bello, T. (1994). Respecting and serving the needs of ESL senior citizens. *TESOL Journal*, 4 (1), 36-39.
- Burnaby, B., & Bell, J. (1991). Adult Literacy Perspectives. In Maurice C. Taylor and James A. Draper, (Eds.), *Adult Literacy Perspectives*, (pp. 185-196). Toronto: Culture Concepts Inc.,
- Burnaby, B., & Thomas, R. (1998). *Language and Politics in the United States and Canada*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Community Social Planning Council of Toronto (2005). *Renewing Toronto's ESL Programs- Charting a Course Towards More Effective ESL Program Delivery*. Toronto, Canada: Author.
- Citizenship and Immigration Canada (2006). *Consultations on the Settlement and Language Training Services Needs of Newcomers*. Accessible at: <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/pub/coia-summary.html>
- Cleghorn, L. (2000). *Managing LINC: An Ethnography of a Federal Language Training Program for Adult Immigrants*. Unpublished MA Thesis, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto (OISE/UT).
- Cummings, J., Jacot, M., & Parau, A. (2006). *An Investigation of Best Practice in the Instruction and Assessment of LINC Literacy Learners in Ontario*. Ontario, Canada: Jangles Productions.
- Derwing, T.M., & Malicky G. (1992). Bilingualism. *Reflections on Canadian literacy*, 10 (4), 220-225.
- Derwing, T. M., & Malicky G. (1993). Literacy learning of adults in a bilingual ESL classroom. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 39(4), 393-406.
- ECALA. (2006). *ECALA Focus Group Report 2006*. Accessed on: August 15, 2007 at [www.ecala.org](http://www.ecala.org).
- Fitzgerald, J. (2000). How will bilingual/ESL programs in literacy change in the next millennium? *Reading Research Quarterly*, 25 (4), 520-524.
- Hakuta H., Bialystok, E., & Wiley, E. (2003). Critical evidence: a test of the critical-period hypothesis for second-language acquisition. *Psychological Science* 14 (1), 31-38.



- Kenny, M. and Cap, I. (2003). *Community-Based Language Training for Immigrant Women and Seniors in Manitoba*. Winnipeg, MB: Author.
- Lamba, N. K., Mulder, M., & Wilkinson, L. (2000). *Immigrants and Ethnic Minorities on the Prairies: A Statistical Compendium*. Edmonton, AB: The Prairie Centre of Excellence for Research on Immigration and Integration.
- Morgan, B. D. (2002). Critical practice in community-based ESL programs: a Canadian perspective. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, 1 (2), 141-162.
- Nicholls, M., & Raleigh, R. (1998). *Understanding Life in Australia: ESL for Older Learners. A Resource for Teachers*. Melbourne; Vic: Adult, Community, Further Education Board.
- Orem, R.A. (2001). Journal writing in adult ESL: Improving practice through reflective writing. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 90, 69-77.
- Shane, R. (1992). *Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada: An evaluative framework study*. Ottawa, ON: Employment and Immigration Canada.
- Spore, M. (1980). *Extending Adult Basic Education to the Elderly: A Guide to Program Development*. Albany, NY: The New York State Education Department.
- Taviss, R., & Simces, Z. (2004). *English as a Second Language Services Review. Phase 1: Current Practices and Critical Issues*. Prepared for the Ministry of Community, Aboriginal and Women's Services and Ministry of Advanced Education, British Columbia. Vancouver, BC: Author.
- Taylor, L. E., & Taylor-Henley, S., Doan, L. (2005). Older immigrants: language competencies and mental health. *Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health*, 24 (2), 23-34.
- Taylor, L. E., Taylor-Henley, S., Doan, L., & Newman, P. (2003). Resiliency and well-being: reflections of older adults on immigration and integration. Edmonton, AB: Author
- TESL Ontario, (2007). *Challenges and solutions in ESL delivery: TESL Ontario's first annual panel on ESL in Ontario*. Accessed on October 15, 2007 at <http://www.teslontario.org/new/conference/2007/ChallengesandSolutions.pdf>
- Zhu, Wenli. (2007). *It is never too old to learn - a quasi-ethnographic account on Chinese seniors who take LINC program in OCCSC*. Ottawa, ON: Author.



Wilson, K. (1998). *Teachers' Perception of Factors that influence seniors' L2 Acquisition*. Project Report, Department of Educational Psychology, University of Alberta. Edmonton, AB: Author.



## Appendix A: Table 1, Program Structure

Prov.	Program Type	Funding	Setting	Partnerships
BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English language program</li> <li>Volunteer-run</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provincial (fully funds the organization which in turn budgets the English program)</li> <li>Student fees (for people with few financial resources, fees are waived)</li> </ul>	Non-profit, community-based, multi-service, multi-cultural organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This program has an informal partnership with an ESL organization for exchange of information and professional development opportunities.</li> <li>This program is part of organization's settlement and adaptation program, with many other programs/events that the students can access .</li> <li>This organization as a whole has partnerships with several different agencies for exchange of information, skills, and services.</li> </ul>
BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English language program</li> <li>Volunteer-run</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Student fees</li> </ul>	Non-profit, community-based organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students can access organization's many other programs, which include settlement and integration</li> <li>Organization as a whole has partnerships with several different agencies for exchange of information, skills and services</li> </ul>
BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English language program</li> <li>Volunteer-run</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Student fees</li> </ul>	Non-profit, non-governmental, multi-service, social service organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This program has partnerships with language programs in other community centres for joint learning.</li> <li>Students can access the organization's many other programs, which include settlement and integration.</li> <li>The organization as a whole has partnerships with several different agencies for exchange of information, skills, and services.</li> </ul>
BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English language program</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provincial</li> <li>Various funding sources (they fund the organization which in turn budgets the English program)</li> </ul>	Non-profit, community-based organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students can access organization's other programs which target immigrant and refugee communities</li> </ul>
BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English language program</li> <li>Volunteer-run</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Municipal</li> <li>Fundraising</li> </ul>	Non-profit, community-based organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This program is part of an outreach program that includes settlement and other services and activities, which the students can access.</li> <li>The outreach program and the organization as a whole have partnerships with different agencies for exchange of information, skills, and services</li> </ul>



BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English language program</li> <li>Volunteer-run</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Student fees</li> </ul>	Community-based organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students can access the organization's other programs, which all centre around settlement and integration and target immigrant and refugee communities.</li> <li>This organization as a whole has partnerships with several different agencies for exchange of information, skills, and services.</li> </ul>
AB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English language program</li> <li>Partly volunteer-run</li> </ul> <p>(Began a LINC for seniors program in fall, 2007)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provincial</li> <li>Occasional student fees (based on need)</li> </ul>	Non-profit, non-governmental, community-based, immigrant serving organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students can access the organization's other programs, which all centre around settlement and integration and target immigrant populations.</li> </ul>
AB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English language program</li> <li>Volunteer-run</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provincial</li> <li>Student fees (for people with few financial resources, fees are waived)</li> </ul>	School-based, board-governed institution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul>
AB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English language program</li> <li>Volunteer-run</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Student fees</li> </ul>	Non-profit, community-based organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This program is associated with an immigrant-serving organization, which provides the volunteer teacher.</li> <li>Students can access the organization's other programs, which all centre around settlement and integration and benefit from various partnerships with non-profit and immigrant serving agencies.</li> </ul>
SK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English language program</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One-time federal grants</li> </ul>	Non-profit, community-based settlement agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul>
SK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English language program</li> <li>Partly volunteer-run</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Endowment program</li> </ul>	Community-based organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This program is run with the help of a school-based institution that is partnered with a non-profit settlement organization in the community; the settlement organization provides the ESL teacher and offers support services that the students can access.</li> <li>The program also has loose partnerships with institutions offering literacy and ESL programming for sharing of information, learners and expertise.</li> </ul>



MB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English language program</li> <li>Partly volunteer-run</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provincial</li> </ul>	Community-based social service organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This program is run in partnership with many community-based organizations who provide space, expertise, workers, volunteers, and participant recruitment assistance.</li> <li>Students can also access the organization's other programs and support services, all geared towards seniors.</li> </ul>
ON	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LINC program for seniors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Federal</li> </ul>	Non-profit, community-based organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This program is part of a newcomer assistance and integration program within the organization, which also offers many ethno-cultural senior programs and services that the students can access.</li> <li>Organization as a whole has partnerships with several different agencies for exchange of information, skills, and services.</li> </ul>
ON	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English language program</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Various funding sources (they fund the organization which in turn budgets the English program)</li> </ul>	Non-profit, community-based organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This program is part of the organization's senior programming, which includes various support services and benefits from partnerships with various agencies.</li> </ul>
ON	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CLIC program</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Federal</li> </ul>	School-based institution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Program includes activities such as information sessions, which are run with the help of different types of agencies.</li> </ul>
ON	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ESL program</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provincial</li> <li>Students fees</li> </ul>	School-based institution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The institution partners with community-based organizations for space to house their program.</li> </ul>
ON	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LINC program</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Federal</li> </ul>	Non-profit, community-based organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The settlement worker in the organization works with the LINC program to set up informal drop-in English social groups run by volunteers in local libraries for those who might not qualify for the LINC program.</li> <li>Students can access organization's other programs, which all centre around settlement and integration and benefit from partnerships with various agencies for exchange of information, skills, and services.</li> </ul>
ON	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ESL program</li> <li>LINC program for seniors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ESL: none (funding for this school-board program comes from the province, and student fees, but goes directly to the school board, not this service provider)</li> </ul>	Non-profit, community-based social service and settlement organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For both the ESL and LINC programs, the organization partners with community-based organizations that provide space, for free or at reduced rates, for their classes.</li> <li>The ESL program operates in partnership with a local</li> </ul>



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LINC: federal</li> </ul>		<p>school board, which also provides the teaching staff.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students can access the organization's other programs, which all centre around settlement and integration and benefit from partnerships with various agencies for exchange of information.</li> </ul>
ON	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ESL program</li> <li>LINC program</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ESL: administrative fee (funding for this school-board program comes from the province and student fees, but goes directly to the school board, not this service provider)</li> <li>LINC: federal</li> </ul>	Non-profit, community-based organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The ESL program operates in partnership with a local school board, which provides the teaching staff and premises for some of the classes.</li> <li>Students can access the organization's other programs, which centre around integrated settlement services.</li> </ul>
ON	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LINC program</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Federal</li> </ul>	Non-profit, community-based organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With limited support services on-site, the organization is associated with an immigrant association offering various integration and settlement services that the students can access.</li> </ul>
ON	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ESL program</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provincial</li> </ul>	School-based institution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This program runs by means of partnerships with different types of agencies, which provide the space to house the program.</li> <li>It has partnerships with a number of community agencies, which offer settlement services that the students can access.</li> <li>It works closely with other ESL providers to share program setup procedures, etc.</li> </ul>
ON	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ESL program and LINC program offered in a blended formula and geared towards seniors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ESL: provincial</li> <li>LINC: federal</li> </ul>	School-based institution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This program partners with the public library system, which houses the blended program for free.</li> <li>It works with a local seniors' organization for exchange of information and community resource referrals.</li> </ul>
QC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FSL program</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None (funding for this school-board program comes from the province and student fees, but goes directly to the school board,</li> </ul>	Community-based organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This program operates in partnership with a local school board, which provides the teaching staff; the organization provides space and administrative support.</li> </ul>



		not this service provider)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Students can access the organization's other programs, which are all geared towards seniors.</li></ul>
--	--	----------------------------	--	--



## Appendix B: Table 2, Program Details

Prov	Eligibility Criteria	Number of Classes, Size, & Schedule	Locations	Staffing	Program Evaluation	Accessibility (access by transit & building accessibility)	Transportation provided?	Child-minding provided?
BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Age 55+</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 class</li> <li>Avg. class size: 20-25 students</li> <li>Mon-Wed, Fri, 9:30-11am</li> <li>3 terms of 3 months</li> </ul>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3 volunteer teachers</li> <li>2 admin staff (for all programming)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Committee meetings every two months</li> <li>End-of-term informal teacher evaluations</li> <li>Annual survey for teachers and students</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In close proximity of transit stop</li> <li>Wheelchair accessible</li> </ul>	No	Yes
BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Age 55+ (flexible if spaces available)</li> <li>Members of organization</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 class (if enrolment high, 2 classes)</li> <li>Avg. class size: 20 students</li> <li>Tue &amp; Thu, 1-3pm</li> <li>3 terms of 10 weeks</li> </ul>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2 volunteer teachers</li> <li>1 programs coordinator (for all programming)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bi-annual evaluations (done by coordinator, volunteer teachers, and students)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Downtown; in close proximity of transit stop</li> <li>Wheelchair accessible</li> </ul>	No	No
BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Age 55+ (flexible)</li> <li>Ethno-specific (Chinese-speaking)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>12 classes</li> <li>Avg. class size: 15-30 students</li> <li>Mon - Sat, 9-11:30am, 11:30am-1:30pm</li> <li>1 term from Sept.-June</li> <li>1 summer package</li> </ul>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>20 volunteer teachers</li> <li>1 programs coordinator</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Beginning of the year teacher evaluations (done by coordinator)</li> <li>Ongoing evaluations (done by students and class monitors)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In close proximity of transit stop</li> <li>Wheelchair accessible</li> </ul>	No	No



BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Age 60+ (preference)</li> <li>Permanent residents, citizens</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 class</li> <li>Avg. class size: 15-20 students</li> <li>Wed &amp; Fri, 1:30-3:30pm</li> <li>2 terms between Sept.-July</li> </ul>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 teacher/senior ESL coordinator</li> <li>1 ESL programs manager</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quarterly evaluations for funder (done by teacher/coordin. and program manager)</li> <li>Bi-annual evaluations (done by students)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In close proximity of transit stop</li> <li>Wheelchair accessible</li> </ul>	No	No
BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Seniors</li> <li>Members of organization</li> <li>Ethno-specific (Spanish-speaking)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 class</li> <li>Avg. class size: 8-12 students</li> <li>Wed, 11am-12pm</li> <li>Ongoing</li> </ul>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 volunteer teacher</li> <li>1 outreach program leader</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In close proximity of transit stop</li> <li>Wheelchair accessible</li> </ul>	No	No
BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Age 55+</li> <li>Permanent residents, citizens, refugees, visitors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 class</li> <li>Avg. class size: 5-10 students</li> <li>Tue &amp; Thu, 12:20-2:20pm</li> <li>3 terms of 12 weeks</li> </ul>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 volunteer teacher</li> <li>1 ESL volunteer coordinator</li> <li>1 English programs manager</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Formal end-of-term course and teacher evaluations (done by students)</li> <li>Informal ongoing student feedback</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In close proximity of transit stop</li> <li>Wheelchair accessible</li> </ul>	No	No
AB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Seniors</li> <li>Canadian citizens, immigrants, refugees, non-visitors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7 classes</li> <li>Avg. class size: 12-18 students</li> <li>Mon – Thu mornings</li> <li>3 terms of 10 weeks</li> </ul>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4 teachers</li> <li>8-10 volunteers</li> <li>1 admin assistant</li> <li>1 manager of language programs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>End-of-term evaluations (done by students)</li> <li>End-of-year evaluation for funder (done by manager and teachers)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In close proximity of transit stop</li> <li>Limited wheelchair accessibility (no automated doors or washrooms for disabled)</li> </ul>	No	No
AB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Age 55+</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6 classes</li> <li>Avg. class size:</li> </ul>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10 volunteer teachers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ongoing and end-of-term</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In close proximity of transit stop</li> </ul>	Transit tickets provided only	No



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10 students</li> <li>Tue &amp; Thu, 9-3pm</li> <li>3 terms of 10 weeks</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 coordinator for volunteers</li> <li>1 language programs coordinator</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>evaluations (done by students)</li> <li>End-of-year reports to funder</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wheelchair accessible</li> </ul>	in financial difficulty	
AB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Age 55+ (preference)</li> <li>Ethno-specific (Chinese-speaking)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3 classes</li> <li>Avg. class size: 13-30 students</li> <li>Tue afternoons, Wed &amp; Fri mornings</li> <li>2-3 terms of 10-15 weeks</li> </ul>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3 volunteer instructors</li> <li>1 admin staff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On-going evaluations (done by students)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In close proximity of transit stop</li> <li>Wheelchair accessible</li> </ul>	No	No
SK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3 classes</li> <li>Avg. class size: 5-12 students</li> <li>Tue – Thu, 9:30am-12h30pm</li> <li>16-week program</li> </ul>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2 teachers</li> <li>1 project coordinator</li> <li>1 admin assistant</li> <li>1 executive director</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mid-term report for funder (done by project coordinator with teachers, partly based on evaluations from students)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In close proximity of transit stop</li> <li>Wheelchair accessible entrance</li> </ul>	No	Depends on funding
SK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Age 50+</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 class</li> <li>Avg. class size: 8-10 students</li> <li>Fri, 1:15-3:15pm</li> <li>1 term of 8 months</li> </ul>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 instructor</li> <li>12 volunteer peers</li> <li>1 trainer for volunteers</li> <li>1 coordinator</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Occasional external evaluations</li> <li>Volunteer training sessions evaluations (done by volunteers)</li> <li>Informal volunteer tutor evaluations (done by coordinator)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In close proximity of transit stop</li> <li>Wheelchair accessible</li> </ul>	Based on need (taxis, car pooling)	No
MB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Age 55+</li> <li>Legal</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>21 classes</li> <li>Avg. class size:</li> </ul>	11 (3 in the	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>21 teachers</li> <li>10 volunteer</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>End-of-year evaluations (done</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In close proximity of transit stop</li> </ul>	Pick up and drop off, and	In some locations



	residents, non-visitors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>12-20 students</li> <li>• Mon-Sun, mornings, afternoons, evenings;</li> <li>• 3 terms of 10-12 weeks</li> <li>• Informal summer program in June/July</li> </ul>	summer )	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TAs</li> <li>• Several volunteer language partners</li> <li>• 13 bi/tri-lingual community liaison workers</li> <li>• Several drivers</li> <li>• Occasional interpreters</li> </ul>	by coordinator and based on student evaluations)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wheelchair accessible</li> </ul>	transit tickets provided based on need	
ON	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seniors</li> <li>• LINC criteria</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 senior-specific LINC class</li> <li>• Avg. class size: 11-14 students</li> <li>• Sat, 9:30am-12:20pm</li> <li>• 2 sessions form Sept.-July</li> </ul>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 teacher</li> <li>• 1 ethno-cultural seniors' community development worker (for all senior programming)</li> <li>• 1 coordinating staff (for all senior programming)</li> <li>• 1 settlement worker</li> <li>• 1 executive director</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regular client satisfaction surveys</li> <li>• Ongoing feedback from students</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In close proximity of transit stop</li> <li>• Wheelchair accessible</li> </ul>	Transit tickets provided	No
ON	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Age 55+ (flexible)</li> <li>• Non-</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 class</li> <li>• Avg. class size: 5 students</li> </ul>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 teacher</li> <li>• 1 seniors' program</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ongoing feedback from students</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In close proximity of transit stop</li> <li>• Wheelchair</li> </ul>	Transit tickets provided	No



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>visitors</li> <li>Ethno-specific (Spanish-speaking)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thu, 1-3pm</li> <li>1 term from Sept.-June</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>coordinator</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>accessible</li> </ul>		
ON	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LINC criteria</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9 classes (2 with seniors)</li> <li>Mon - Fri, 9-11:15am</li> <li>1 term</li> </ul>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4 instructors (for all classes)</li> <li>1 teaching assistant</li> <li>1 coordinator</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ongoing feedback from students</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Close to transit stop</li> <li>Wheelchair accessible</li> </ul>	Transit tickets provided	Available to seniors in the summer
ON	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Open to all citizens, non-citizens</li> <li>1 location for age 55+</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2 classes with seniors</li> <li>Avg. class size: 25-35 students</li> <li>Mon &amp; Fri, 9:30am-12:00pm; Thu, 9:30am-2:00pm</li> <li>3 terms of 12 weeks</li> </ul>	2 (with seniors)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2 teachers</li> <li>1 coordinator</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Informal ongoing feedback</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In close proximity of transit stop</li> <li>Wheelchair accessible</li> </ul>	Transit tickets provided for field trips	No
ON	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LINC criteria</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>16 classes (14 with senior majority)</li> <li>Avg. class size: 15-25 students</li> <li>Mon – Sat, mornings, afternoons, evenings</li> <li>1 term from Sept. to July</li> </ul>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>11 teachers</li> <li>15 volunteers</li> <li>4 support staff</li> <li>1 coordinator</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual program evaluations (done by students)</li> <li>Teacher evaluations (done by support staff)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In close proximity of transit stop</li> <li>Wheelchair accessible building but not washrooms</li> </ul>	Transit tickets provided as of this year	No
ON	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ESL: citizens,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>13 ESL classes</li> <li>4 LINC classes</li> </ul>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8 bilingual teachers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual written evaluation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In close proximity of transit stop</li> </ul>	Transit tickets provided only	No



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>permanent residents, refugee claimants, non-visitors</li> <li>LINC: LINC criteria</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Avg. class size: 20 students</li> <li>Classes 2x/week for a maximum of 6 hours</li> <li>1 term from Sept.-June</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 coordinator</li> <li>3 ISAP workers (in the organization)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ongoing oral feedback from students</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wheelchair accessible</li> </ul>	in LINC program	
ON	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ESL: citizens, permanent residents, refugee claimants, non-visitors</li> <li>LINC: LINC criteria</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>58 ESL classes</li> <li>39 LINC classes (seniors mainly in lower levels)</li> <li>Avg. class size: 15-20 students</li> <li>Mon – Sun</li> <li>3 terms of 3 months</li> </ul>	2 LINC sites  11-12 ESL sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>40 ESL teachers</li> <li>24 LINC teachers</li> <li>3 coordinators</li> <li>1 program manager</li> <li>Various admin staff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual program surveys (done by students)</li> <li>Ongoing teacher self-evaluations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In close proximity of transit stop</li> <li>Wheelchair accessible</li> </ul>	Transit tickets provided in LINC program	No
ON	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LINC criteria</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6 classes (2 classes with some seniors)</li> <li>Avg. class size: 10-12 students</li> <li>Mon – Thu, 9am-2:30pm; Friday, 9am-1pm</li> <li>1 term from Sept.-June</li> </ul>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4 teachers</li> <li>3 child-minders</li> <li>2 admin staff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bi-annual teacher/program evaluations (by management and students)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In close proximity of transit stop</li> <li>Not wheelchair accessible (only ramp to entrance)</li> </ul>	Limited number of transit tickets provided, if eligible	No
ON	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Citizens, permanent residents, refugees, refugee claimants</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3 classes with senior majority</li> <li>Avg. class size: of 15-20 students</li> </ul>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 instructor per site</li> <li>Coordinator</li> <li>Itinerant curriculum</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual joint review for funders (done by support and supervision staff consultants; includes instructor</li> </ul>	Missing	No	No



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mon – Fri, 8:30-11:30am; Mon, Tue, Thu, Fri, 10:00am-12:00pm, 1:00pm-3:00pm; Mon - Fri, 9:00-11:45am, 12:30-2:45pm</li> <li>• 3 terms, between Sept.-July</li> </ul>		consultants	self-evaluation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff performance appraisal</li> <li>• Learner satisfaction surveys</li> </ul>			
ON	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ESL: non-citizens, refugee claimants, refugees, permanent residents, visitors</li> <li>• LINC: LINC criteria</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 blended class</li> <li>• Avg. class size: 15-20 students</li> <li>• Tue &amp; Thu, 9:15-11:45am</li> <li>• 3 terms, between Sept.-June</li> </ul>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 instructor</li> <li>• 6-8 volunteers</li> <li>• 1 lead instructor</li> <li>• 1 clerical staff</li> <li>• 1 program coordinator</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual (done by instructor, lead instructors, admin staff and students)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In close proximity of transit stop</li> <li>• Wheelchair accessible</li> </ul>	Limited number of transit tickets provided only in LINC program	No
QC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Age 50+</li> <li>• Canadian citizens, permanent residents, political refugees</li> <li>• Members of organization</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 class</li> <li>• Avg. class size: 22-25 students</li> <li>• Mon &amp; Wed, 1-4pm</li> <li>• 1 term, from Sept.-June</li> </ul>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 teacher</li> <li>• Admin staff on site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bi-annual teacher evaluations</li> <li>• End-of-term informal evaluations (done by students)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In close proximity of transit stop</li> <li>• Wheelchair accessible</li> </ul>	No	No



## Appendix C: Table 3, Profile of Older Learners

Prov.	Age Range	Gender Ratio	Countries of Origin	Years since arrival to Canada	Literacy Levels	Main reasons for attending program	Dimensions of Aging (physical and cognitive factors)
BC	65/70	90% female	China; Hong Kong; Central and South America	1 month to 15/20 years (90% are 3+ years)	Very low to literate (90%)	To network; to socialize; to practice English	Some vision and mobility problems
BC	55 - 80	80% female	Mixed, but mainly Southeast Asia; Eastern Europe	1-10 years	Varied	Functional English; communicate with grandchildren; socialize	Vision; cognitive impairment
BC	55-89	More females	Hong Kong; Mainland China; Southeast Asia	Over 60% newcomers (within 1-2 years); others 4-6 years; some Canadian citizens	Some illiterate	To learn English in order to communicate with their grandchildren, to be able to take care of them; to enjoy the community aspect, friends and networking; classes are affordable	Short concentration span and memory problems
BC	65-81	1 male: 4 females	Mixed; Vietnam; China; Taiwan; Malaysia; Central and South America; India; Sri Lanka; Afghanistan	5-20	Literate	Participate in the community; communicate with grandchildren; function by themselves (go shopping, to the doctor)	Various health issues (some requiring medication); mobility and vision problems; post-trauma
BC	80-94	100% women	Latin America	10-15 year; occasional newcomers	Very mixed	To learn English to communicate; to keep up with some type of conversation, general knowledge of the language	Vision, hearing problems; memory retention problems
BC	55+	Don't know	Mixed, but mainly Farsi-speaking (Iranian, Persian)	Don't know	Varied	To learn English without feeling intimidated by younger, more competent and faster learners; to have some social time	Don't know
AB	50-85	60% female	China; Hong Kong; Korea;	Quite a few	Varied: low to high	Create a sense of community; be	Mobility issues



			Vietnam; Russia; Ukraine; India; Africa, Somalia and Sudan; Philippines; Romania	years; no newcomers	levels	with other people; keep their minds fit by learning; have a sense of independence.	
AB	55-81	60% female	Mixed (Eastern Europe, Russia, Moldavia, Ukraine, Bulgaria, Africa – Eritrea, Ghana; South America - Peru, Argentina, Columbia; Afghanistan)	Approx. 6 years	80-85% strong literacy skills	Improve English communication skills; be part of the community; socialize	Various medical problems; hearing and vision issues
AB	65 - 85	80% female	Southeast Asia: China, Hong Kong, Taiwan	Approx. 10 years	Low literacy	Learn enough English to communicate with their grandchildren; functional English; socialize	Memory retention; mobility, vision problems
SK	65-78	1 male: 10 females	Mainly China	20 years; few newcomers (2-3 years)	Literate	Mainly socialization	Some vision problems
SK	50-85	50:50	Very mixed: China; Eritrea; Kosovo; Burma; Korea	2-15+ years	Varied (1/3 illiterate; some high literacy)	For those who still work (about half), they want to learn English for work; for the retired, to be able to integrate into Canadian society, have Canadian friends, to connect to and be more involved with the community, to acclimatize to Canada, to come out of their isolation	Vision, hearing, and various other health challenges; isolation/depression; post-trauma
MB	55 - 80	2/3 female	47 different language backgrounds, but mainly Chinese, Vietnamese, Philippine, Punjabi, Russian	5-10 years	Varied (illiterate to university-educated)	Independence; confidence; develop relationships with English speakers; participate in the community	Various health problems; memory retention problems; isolation
ON	Late 50s-70s	60% female	Very mixed; South Asian; Punjabi, Urdu, Tamil, Gujarati, Guyanese speakers	Varies greatly	Varied, but none illiterate	To learn English to be able to communicate with other people in their community; to socialize and overcome isolation; to build a network of social support	Mobility, hearing, vision problems; various medical issues which require medication; memory retention problems; depression-like issues



ON	75-85	All females	South America	18 years	Varied; some low literacy	Socialize to avoid isolation	Mobility, hearing, vision, memory retention problems; Alzheimer's; isolation
ON	60-70	100% female	Haiti	Less than 5 years; one over 10 years	Illiterate to low literacy	To learn functional French (to be able to function alone, get around on their own in the community, ask for things, directions and be understood, take a bus, read packaging when they go shopping, read the newspaper, listen to the radio, help their grandchildren with homework, read a book to them); to create a network; it's a motivation to leave their house in the morning.	Vision and mobility problems (cataracts; arthritis); memory problems; anxiety
ON	55-80s	Majority females	Very mixed; Asia; Portugal; Italy; Poland; Eastern Europe	3 to approx. 10 years.	Varied, but none illiterate	To be able to speak with their grandchildren; for those whose grandchildren are grown, to have a place to go and a social group to interact with; to have survival English skills	Health issues which require frequent medical appointments; vision and mobility problems
ON	60s-mid-80s	More females	Majority from Mainland China	Newcomer to 10 years	Literate	To learn Survival English; to be able to communicate with their grandchildren; to get outside and socialize; to be in a classroom with people from the same ethnic background, which makes them feel comfortable	Hearing and vision problems; tiredness; memory retention problems
ON	60s-90s	75-80% females	Former Soviet Union countries; Israel; Spanish-speaking South America; France; Iran; Korea	ESL: approx. 4 years  LINC: 1-2 weeks to 3 years	Literate	To learn English; to socialize; to become aware of Canadian culture	Mobility, vision, hearing problems; memory problems, Alzheimer's, dementia; post-trauma



ON	55+	LINC: 72% females to 28% male  ESL non- LINC: 68% female to 32% male	Asia; Mainland China; Hong Kong; Portugal; Sri Lanka	ESL: 5+ years LINC: less than 3 years	Literate	Listening and speaking skills to be able to communicate	Some mobility issues
ON	Approx. 65	Approx. equal	Mainly East Africa and Albania; also Asia; Latin America; Eastern Europe	Newcomers to 5 years	Very mixed; illiterate to highly literate	To learn English, to be able to communicate when going to the doctor or the hospital; to perform daily tasks independently; to be able to take care of their grandchildren; to integrate into the Canadian society; to communicate with different ethnic groups; to get out of their home and have a social place to go	Mobility issues; vision and hearing difficulties; memory retention issues; anxiety due to financial limitations; post-trauma
ON	50+	65% female	Very mixed		Some low literacy	To interact, to form some kind of a social network support group	Hearing and vision problems
ON	50-80	3 females : 1 male	Eastern Europe; Asia	Less than 3 to 5 years	Literate	Location; to learn English and socialize	Vision, mobility (dexterity), hearing issues
QC	60	Majority women	Latin America; Asia Minor: Cambodia, Vietnam; Eastern Europe; Portugal; Anglophone Canada	Some less than 3 years, some over 10 years	Literate	Functional French	



## Appendix D: Framework for Data Collection

Categories	Details
<b>1. Program Structure</b>	<p>a. <i>Program type and funding:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ESL/FSL/LINC</li> <li>• Sources of funding (funding partnerships)</li> <li>• Budget (average running cost per student)</li> <li>• Extra costs associated with senior group (e.g., materials, transport, snacks etc.)</li> <li>• Participant fees</li> </ul>
	<p>b. <i>Setting</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Type/size of agency (e.g., NGO-based, school-based, institution-based, community-based, religion-based etc.)</li> <li>• Partnerships <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Stand-alone or partnered with other agencies</li> <li>◆ On-site or referral to support services (e.g., settlement services, counseling, legal aid, health care, daycare etc.)</li> <li>◆ Linked with other language programs (e.g., LINC, other senior language programs etc.)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
	<p>c. <i>Program details</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eligibility (age, immigration status, catchment area)</li> <li>• Number of classes (in total; per level)</li> <li>• Average class size</li> <li>• Number of locations</li> <li>• Times of operation (frequency per week, length of session, number of sessions per year and time)</li> <li>• Child-minding</li> </ul>
	<p>d. <i>Staffing</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of staff/teachers/volunteers/interpreters</li> <li>• Professional training</li> <li>• Professional development opportunities (e.g., upgrading, seminars, etc.)</li> <li>• Does staff reflect the cultural diversity of the community, where possible?</li> </ul>
	<p>e. <i>Program evaluation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Frequency</li> <li>• Evaluators (e.g., manager/coordinator(s), teacher(s), students)</li> <li>• Feedback (how results are integrated into program)</li> </ul>
<b>2. Facilities</b>	<p>a. <i>Accessibility to location</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transportation services</li> <li>• Public transit tickets</li> <li>• Distance from public transit</li> </ul>



	<p>b. <i>On-site accessibility specific to older adults</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Into the building (e.g., ramps etc.)</li> <li>• Inside the building (e.g., elevators, washroom accessibility etc.)</li> <li>• Classroom set-up (e.g., lighting, chairs etc.)</li> </ul>
<b>3. Learner Characteristics</b>	<p>a. <i>Demographic characteristics</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Age range</li> <li>• Gender</li> <li>• Source country of learners</li> <li>• Length of time in Canada (0-5 years; 6-10 years)</li> <li>• First language literacy</li> <li>• Reasons for/interests in attending program</li> </ul>
	<p>b. <i>Aging dimension</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Physical characteristics (e.g., hearing, vision, mobility etc.)</li> <li>• Psychological characteristics (e.g., memory problems, depression etc.)</li> <li>• What kind of special physical and psychological factors of your learners do you have to take into account?</li> </ul>
<b>4. Program Model</b>	<p>a. <i>Purpose</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall concrete objectives and expected outcomes of the program</li> <li>• Strictly ESL training or settlement integration orientation as well? (e.g., elder abuse, legal aid, practicalities of daily living: banking etc.)</li> </ul>
	<p>b. <i>Curriculum</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Model (standard curriculum or learner-driven)</li> <li>• Number of levels</li> <li>• Length of time in various levels</li> <li>• Learning outcomes per level</li> <li>• Learner evaluation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Assessment at placement</li> <li>◆ Ongoing assessment per level</li> <li>◆ Learning outcome assessment: short-term, long-term (Do you track your learners after exiting program?)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Content <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Valuing learners' expertise/assets, sharing of experiences (How does the curriculum build on the learner strengths?)</li> <li>◆ Educating about Canadian systems/issues/events</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Related social activities (e.g., visits, field trips etc.)</li> </ul>



	<p>c. <i>Resources</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Teaching materials (e.g., books, manuals, audio language tapes, on-line etc.)</li><li>• Equipment (e.g., blackboards, audiovisual equipment, computers etc.)</li><li>• Special tools for seniors (e.g., large print, magnifying glasses, hearing aids etc.)</li><li>• Other resources socially and culturally appropriate to your older adult learners</li><li>• Your own in-house or “made at home” resources</li><li>• Any other in-house programs that support language learning that the older adults attend (e.g., sharing circles etc.)?</li></ul>
<b>5. Best Practices</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• What strategies do you find most effective in achieving your program goals?</li><li>• In promoting participation?</li><li>• In meeting the needs of older adults?</li></ul>



## Appendix E: Letter of Introduction – English and French

(enter date)

(enter address)

Dear (enter name):

We are writing to invite you to participate in an analysis of second language training programs for older adults in Canada. The study is funded by the Settlement and Intergovernmental Affairs Directorate of Citizenship and Immigration Canada, Ontario Region, and is being conducted by Dr. Lynn McDonald, Director of the Institute for Life Course and Aging at the University of Toronto, and Dr. Usha George, Dean of the Faculty of Community Services at Ryerson University.

We are interested in your program because it is one of the few in the country that offers language training specifically for older adults. The “Analysis of Second Language Training Programs for Older Adults Across Canada” will consider the models and best practices used in these programs to enhance current programming. We want to hear from you about how such programs can be most successful.

A member of the University of Toronto Research Team will be contacting you shortly to ask for your administrative consent to participate in this study. Participation involves discussing your program(s) with the researchers. They will ask for details about the program(s)’ setting, partnerships, teaching materials, your best practices, and the characteristics of and considerations for older learners. We hope to be able to speak to the person(s) best able to provide such information about your program. The data will be collected by e-mail and telephone. There will be no cost to your organization – all long-distance and postage costs (where applicable) will be covered.

We expect that this information would be useful to your programming as well, and will gladly share the findings with your organization when the report is complete. The report will also include a literature review and key informant interviews with experts in the field of ESL/FSL for older adults. The report is expected in November 2007 and will be posted at [www.settlement.org](http://www.settlement.org) following its review by CIC.

Your participation in this project is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Citizenship and Immigration Canada



(date)  
(adresse)

Cher/Chère (nom):

Nous vous écrivons pour vous inviter à participer à un projet d'analyse des programmes de formation en langue seconde au Canada pour les personnes âgées. Ce projet est financé par la Direction de l'établissement et des affaires intergouvernementales du Ministère de la Citoyenneté et de l'Immigration du Canada de la Région de l'Ontario et mené par Dr. Lynn McDonald, Directrice de l'Institut de recherche sur le cycle de vie et le vieillissement de l'Université de Toronto et Dr. Usha George, Doyenne de la Faculté des services communautaires de l'Université Ryerson.

Nous nous intéressons à votre programme parce qu'il compte parmi les rares programmes au Canada à offrir une formation en langue seconde adaptée spécialement aux personnes âgées. L'"**Analyse des programmes de formation en langue seconde au Canada pour les personnes âgées**" examinera les modèles et les pratiques exemplaires employés dans ces programmes afin de faire ressortir des stratégies à adopter pour améliorer la mise en oeuvre des programmes de langue seconde actuellement offerts par CIC. Nous souhaitons apprendre de vous comment de tels programmes peuvent être les plus réussis.

Un membre de l'équipe de recherche à l'Université de Toronto vous contactera prochainement pour obtenir votre consentement de participer à cette étude. Votre participation consiste à discuter de votre programme avec les chercheurs. Ils vous demanderont des renseignements sur le contexte de votre programme, vos partenariats, le matériel didactique que vous utilisez, vos pratiques exemplaires, et les besoins et les caractéristiques que présentent les apprenants aînés. Nous espérons pouvoir consulter la(les) personne(s) la(les) plus apte(s) à nous fournir de tels renseignements sur votre programme. **La collecte des données se fera par courrier électronique et par téléphone** et n'entraînera aucun coût pour votre organisme - tous les frais d'appels interurbains et d'affranchissement (le cas échéant) seront assumés.

Nous espérons que notre étude se révélera utile à votre programme aussi et nous partagerons volontiers nos conclusions avec votre organisme dès que notre rapport sera terminé. Le rapport comprendra aussi un examen de la documentation existante et des entrevues avec des informateurs principaux, des experts dans le domaine de la formation en anglais et français langues secondes pour les personnes âgées. Le rapport est prévu pour novembre 2007 et sera affiché à [www.settlement.org](http://www.settlement.org) après avoir été soumis à l'examen de CIC.

Votre participation à ce projet est grandement appréciée.  
Veuillez agréer ... l'expression de mes sentiments les meilleurs,

Citoyenneté et Immigration Canada



## **Appendix F: Key Informant Interview Guide**

### **Analysis of Second Language Training Programs for Older Adults Across Canada**

#### **Key Informant Interview Guide**

1. Please tell me about your professional experience working in the field of ESL/FSL for older adults.
2. Are there specific models or practices of English and French language training programs for older adults that best achieve the goal of learning a second language?

Probes: “Mixed” classes or ethno-specific?

Probes: What kinds of challenges/barriers hinder the success of such programs (personal/student challenges; program challenges)?

3. What about specific models or practices that best facilitate social, cultural and economic integration into Canada?
4. In your opinion, what are the benefits of these programs to the participants?
5. In your opinion, what are the limitations of these programs to the participants?

Probes:

- Program structure/funding?
- Curriculum?
- Professionalization/training/accreditation of ESL teachers/instructors?

6. How could the programs be more effective?



7. Are there any exemplary programs that you know of, for us to consider in this analysis?
8. Are you aware of any programs or research outside of Canada on ESL/FSL for older adults that would be beneficial to our study?
9. Do you have anything else you would like to add?



## **Appendix G: List of Participating Programs and Key Informants**

### ***Participating Programs***

1. 411 Seniors Centre, Vancouver
2. Age & Opportunity Centre Inc., Winnipeg
3. Bow Valley College, Calgary
4. Calgary Chinese Elderly Citizens' Association, Calgary
5. Centre des aînés Côte-des-Neiges, Montréal
6. Centre for Information & Community Services of Ontario, Toronto
7. DIVERSEcity community resources society, Surrey
8. Dixon Hall – Elderly Person's Centre, Toronto
9. Edmonton Mennonite Centre for Newcomers, Edmonton
10. International Women of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon
11. Jewish Immigrant Aid Services, Toronto
12. Kiwassa Neighbourhood House, Vancouver
13. La Cité collégiale, Ottawa
14. North Shore Multicultural Society, North Vancouver
15. Ottawa Chinese Community Service Centre, Ottawa
16. Rexdale Women's Centre, Etobicoke
17. Seniors' Education Centre (SEC), University of Regina, Regina
18. Somali Immigrant Aid Organization, Toronto
19. South Granville Seniors Centre, Vancouver
20. S.U.C.C.E.S.S., Vancouver
21. Thames Valley District School Board - Wheable Adult Education, London
22. Toronto District School Board - Adult ESL (North York Seniors Centre, Willowdale Manor)
23. Toronto Catholic District School Board - Adult ESL (Arleta Seniors Building, Terra Nova Building, Gower Park Place)

### ***Key Informants***

Tracey Derwing, PhD, University of Alberta  
Roslynne Greenberg, Jewish Immigrant Aid Services, Toronto, ON  
Barabara Krukowski, LINC Coordinator, The Centre, Burlington, ON  
Reza Shahbazi, LINC Coordinator, New Canadians Centre for Excellence, Windsor, ON  
Laura Taylor, PhD., University of Manitoba Centre on Aging



## Appendix H: Resources

See below for a list of some of the resources mentioned. (This is not an exhaustive list.)

### Books/manuals:

Acosta, J. (1995). *Canada coast to coast*. Toronto, Ontario: Nelson Canada.

Angst, Kathy, Christine Bertram, Mary Jean Davis, Linda Johansson, and Francis J. Bonkowski. (2005). *Canadian Snapshots: Linking to the community*. Canada: Pearson Longman ESL.

Bates, Susan. (1991). *Amazing! Canadian Newspaper Stories*. Canada: Pearson Longman ESL.

Burton, Eric and Lois Maharg. (1995). *Going Places: Picture-Based English*. Level 1 and 2. USA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co. Inc.

Fuchs, Marjorie. (1998). *The Oxford Picture Dictionary: Beginning Workbook*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Gati, Sally. (1992). *Literacy in Life Skills*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Gramer, Margot. (1994). *The Basic Oxford Picture Dictionary*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Hutchinson, Tom. (1997). *Lifelines*. Elementary, Pre-Intermediate, and Intermediate Levels. UK: Oxford University Press.

Johansson, Linda, Kathy Angst, Brenda Beer, Sue Martin, Wendy Rebeck, and Nicole Sibilleau. (2005). *Alphabétisation pour immigrants adultes en français langue seconde (FLS) selon les Niveaux de compétence linguistique canadiens*. Ottawa, Ontario: Centre des niveaux de compétence linguistique canadiens.

Kimball, Richard S. (1999). *Life Skills Literacy: Things to Know about Medicine and Health*. US: Walch Publishing.

Kingwell, Gail, Francis J. Bonkowski, Louise Stephenson, and Tara Holmes. (2005). *Canadian Snapshots: Raising Issues*. Canada: Pearson Longman ESL.

Mitra, C. (1999). *On Target! A Resource Book of Assessment Tasks Referenced to the Canadian Language Benchmarks*. Calgary, Alta.: Bow Valley College.



Molinsky, Steven J. and Bill Bliss. (1995). *Side by Side*. Books 1 to 4. Third Edition. USA: Prentice Hall, 1995.

Molinsky, Steven J. and Bill Bliss. (1997). *Word by Word Picture Dictionary*. Scarborough, Ontario: Prentice Hall Allyn and Bacon Canada.

Murphy, Raymond. (2007). *Essential grammar in use*. Third Edition. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Nicholls, M. and Raleigh, R. (1998). *Understanding Life in Australia: ESL for Older Learners. A Resource for Teachers*. Melbourne, AU: Adult, Community, and Further Education Board.

Shapiro, N. and J. Adelson-Goldstein. (1999). *The Oxford Picture Dictionary. Canadian edition*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Thibaudeau, Sandra and Lynda Berish. (1997). *Canadian Concepts*. Second Edition. Scarborough, Ontario: Prentice Hall Allyn and Bacon Canada: Cambridge University Press.

Zaffran, B. and David Krulik. (1990). *Everyday English*. Books 1 and 2. McGraw-Hill ESL/ELT.

(1988). *Ingles sin Barreras. Video-Maestro de Inglés Conversacional*. USA: Lexicon Marketing.

(1998). *New reading 360*. Introductory Level Readers. Ginn & Company.

### Websites:

Singleton, Kate. *Picture Stories for Adult ESL Health Literacy*. Fairfax County (Virginia) Public Schools. [http://www.cal.org/caela/esl\\_resources/Health/healthindex.html](http://www.cal.org/caela/esl_resources/Health/healthindex.html)

Centre for Adult English Language Acquisition. <http://www.cal.org/caela>